



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the three chapters which close the book, Dr. Huntington, as mentioned above, selects three states as illustrations of "the effect of physical environment upon human progress" (p. 1). The worth of the chapter on Germany is impaired by the fact that it was written while the United States was still actively campaigning against that nation, and therefore shows unfortunate traces of a very natural and pardonable animus. The discussion of Turkey wells up from the author's deep personal experiences and is therefore picturesque and heartfelt; it does not, however, advance the solution of his problem much beyond the point reached in his earlier works on the Near East. The chapter on Rome is open to at least three sweeping adverse criticisms. First, patient and detailed research into the writings of the ancients has failed to reveal any marked "downward sweep" of climate in the Mediterranean region within the period of written record, whereas there is wholly adequate proof that some parts of the basin were in general at least as lacking in moisture in ancient times as now (cf. E. C. Semple: *The Ancient Piedmont Route of Northern Mesopotamia*, *Geogr. Rev.*, Vol. 8, 1919, pp. 153-179). Furthermore, it is certainly quite unnecessary to struggle to uphold a topheavy climatic hypothesis in order to explain much of Roman history in terms of geography. It is, for instance, clear enough from the experience of farmers on our own Great Plains that a few years of unusually dry weather has been enough to drive them to better-favored lands, and of farmers over the world that the removal of watershed forests in any region which approaches the lower limit of adequate rainfall is likely to result at times in an insufficient water supply in the dependent lowlands. Both these conditions were marked in certain periods of Roman history. It is likewise obvious to every student of historical or political geography that geographic conditions which may be, on the whole, favorable to a population in an early stage of development may come to cramp that population and prevent or retard progress at a subsequent period. Rome stands as a conspicuous example of this principle. Time and again her statesmen were forced to cast about for new means of solving problems arising out of her dynamic activity in a restricted area, and it is little wonder that unrest and decadence are recurring phenomena in Roman history. In the third place, it seems to be generally agreed by students of social science that human motives and human progress or retrogression cannot possibly be explained on any single ground, not even so broad a field as geography as a whole, much less on one or two phases of climate. Dr. Huntington himself warns the reader on this point in his opening pages—but he seems occasionally to forget the warning.

The third (middle) major division of the book undertakes a discussion of prehistoric evolution in terms of climatic changes. That there have been climatic changes in the geological past is certain. There is likewise evidence to show that changes of environmental conditions affect the metabolism of animals. But to attempt to relate the two in our present state of information results in awakening admiration for the audacity of the author and vigorous suspicion of the validity of his findings. It would seem that geologists, biologists, and anthropologists have much spade work to do before geographers can make effective use of their materials in this suggestive and enticing field of research.

In style, in clarity of presentation, and in typographic attractiveness the book approaches the ideal. No worker in the field of human geography can fail to be stimulated by a perusal of it.

D. S. WHITTLESEY

THE PAN-TURANIAN PROBLEM

M. A. CZAPLICKA. **The Turks of Central Asia in History and at the Present Day: An Ethnological Inquiry into the Pan-Turanian Problem, and Bibliographical Material Relating to the Early Turks and the Present Turks of Central Asia.** 242 pp.; map, bibliogr., index. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1918. 9 x 6 inches.

The subtitle of this book is indicative of its purpose. The question of the political future of Central Asia, a pivotal area in the world's history, becomes of increasing import as to its ancient strategic significance is added increasing significance of its natural riches (see Appendix A for a summary of the resources of Central Asia). Any movement attempting to bring such an area under a single political power perforce seeks justification. Pan-Turanian propaganda has claimed racial unity and the desire for national unity as a basis. On the merits of this claim Miss Czaplicka throws light by an analysis of archeological, historical, and ethnological data of the peoples speaking Turkic languages. Her conclusion is thus expressed: "To speak of the Osmanlis and the Turanian Turks as a racial and cultural unity would be by a stroke of the pen, or by means of a propagandist pamphlet, to wipe away all the invasions, migrations, massacres, and fusions which for twenty centuries have played havoc with that part of the world."

The analysis, occupying only some hundred pages, is of course highly condensed. As an introduction to it one might well use the review—an outline sketch—by H. H. Howorth (*Nature*, 1919, No. 2611, Vol. 104, Nov. 13, pp. 273-274). The second half of the book, another hundred pages, is a bibliography given as “a starting point for further research.” Naturally most of the works are in Russian.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

LOUISE F. BROWN. **The Freedom of the Seas.** xvi and 262 pp.; bibliogr. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1919. \$2.00. 7½ x 5 inches.

This is a concise and brilliantly written history of one of the most difficult of international problems. The phrase “freedom of the seas” has been in everybody’s mouth during the last five years without any general understanding of what it implies, and without appreciation of the fact that it has been similarly debated on the occasion of every war for the last five hundred years. It was on this issue that we fought for independence in the eighteenth century; that we fought England in 1812; and that we entered the world war in 1917.

Literally interpreted, “freedom of the seas” would mean the complete immunity, from capture or molestation, of private property on the seas at all times. It would also mean that trade might be conducted everywhere without discrimination of nationality or without the impediment of protective tariffs—in this sense implying “free trade.” But the term has never been used as connoting complete immunity or comprehensive free trade. It has been employed, almost exclusively, in the form of protest. “When the question has been raised in the past there lay behind it either resentment at inequalities of opportunity in overseas markets or jealousy of the power that controlled the seas” (p. 237).

When Portugal and Spain opened routes to the Indies, it was natural that they should seek to monopolize those routes. The other maritime nations, such as France, England, and Holland, refused, however, to accept this doctrine and fought for “the freedom of the seas” to the extent of their power. Nevertheless, the theory of exclusive or special rights in sea areas has been maintained down to the present time. It was not until 1859 that the tolls imposed by Denmark on ships entering the Baltic Sea were abolished. The United States claimed the Bering Sea as a *mare clausum* in the eighties, though it had protested a similar claim on the part of Russia in 1821. In the late war, the right to monopolize portions of the sea was exercised by the sowing of mines and the proclamation of danger zones.

It is in regard to interference with commerce in time of war that the most bitter and irreconcilable differences have arisen. In such circumstances, belligerents and neutrals have equal interest in the questions of contraband and blockade, of right of search, and of the disposition and destruction of prizes. In the war “neutral commerce has been interrupted to an extent unprecedented in any previous war, and the sea lanes have been made unsafe for travel in a way that makes the days of piracy seem days of gentle usage” (p. 229). The great difficulty has been that agreements on rules to be followed during hostilities have been practically impossible of attainment, since any nation will agree to concede only what it thinks it can yield without weakening itself as a belligerent.

The term “freedom of the seas” has also been used in protest against limitations and restrictions placed upon commerce in times of peace. Thus, “with the development of modern industry, as colonies increased in importance as sources of raw materials and profitable fields of investment, the old desire to guard them for the benefit of nationals grew strong again. Mercantilism revived in new forms. . . . The extension of our navigation laws, which meant our coasting trade monopoly, to our oversea possessions, gave rise to suggestions on the part of Englishmen that it might be desirable to re-enact the British navigation laws” (p. 245).

The position of England on all these questions has been determined by the fact that for centuries she has been the paramount naval power. “The nation that rules the waves today,” says Miss Brown, “is the nation that ruled them in the days when France tried to wrest the trident from her. She claims, and with justice, that she has used her power to make and keep the seas free in time of peace. In time of war, she does not hesitate to state, the seas must be closed to her enemies. When, as in the war just ended, her enemies are the enemies of all freedom, criticism is dumb. But it will not remain dumb” (p. 237). It must be evident, indeed, to any reader of this fascinating book that the only reasonable solution of these most difficult questions is international control of the seas through the establishment of a league of nations.

FREDERICK J. TEGGART